

1953

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9963

the Senator from Massachusetts if that is not correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as I have informed the acting majority leader, I know that my colleagues have received many communications regarding the safety regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission and its work in that field. In an effort to clarify the interpretation the House conferees placed upon the conference report, I have had a conference with representatives of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and have had a communication from the General Accounting Office. I hope that by the time the acting majority leader decides to call up the conference report, that matter will be interpreted in such a way that the report will be satisfactory.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a few moments ago I had the privilege and pleasure of talking with the distinguished Representative from the State of California, JOHN PHILLIPS, who is chairman of the House subcommittee. He says we ought to clarify the report in order that the safety program in question may be continued properly.

I bring up this subject at this time for one purpose. When the conference report is considered by the Senate, it will be voted either up or down. Unfortunately, I shall have to request permission to be absent from the session tomorrow and I desire to make my position clear. I think the conferees on the part of the Senate did pretty well in the conference with the House managers. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and I myself voted against the program; we signed the report, though, as the Senator from Massachusetts knows, we objected to it. When the report comes to a vote in the Senate, in my judgment it would be a mistake to send it back to conference, unless we have something better to offer. The Senator from Louisiana, who was so generous as to say a word in my behalf, agrees that it would be a mistake to send it back without having something better to offer. Either the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts or the distinguished Senator from California will be able to get a statement from me regarding the Interstate Commerce Commission safety program.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to comment on the subject, and to say respectfully to the Senator from Massachusetts that there is no possible way the conference report can be patched up except to do it in a further conference. No understanding that might be entered into with the Interstate Commerce Commission could change the language of the conference report. If Representative PHILLIPS, of California, now has a changed attitude in regard to the question which affects the Interstate Commerce Commission safety regulations, a very simple way to handle it is to reject the conference re-

port, send it back to conference, and then return with language which will protect the safety regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I think that issue ought to be made very clear when the report comes before the Senate tomorrow. I think if an attempt were made to change the language now, outside the framework of the conference report, the result would be a hodgepodge, and the conference report would be wrapped around our necks in the future, as someone might say, "But this is what the conference report says."

We cannot control what may be done in the future, on the basis of any informal understanding that might be worked out with Interstate Commerce Commission. The fact is that a conference report has been submitted which, by its very language, jeopardizes the safety program of the Interstate Commerce Commission. There is therefore but one thing that the Senate should do, in my judgment, and that is to reject the report, and, with all respect and with all politeness, simply say to the conferees on the part of the Senate, "Go back to conference, and return with a conference report with this language eliminated. Do not yield to the House on a matter which jeopardizes the safety of the American people on the highways."

I say most respectfully, but with firm conviction on this matter, the conferees on the part of the Senate have made a great mistake in bringing the conference report to the Senate with that language in it, and I think we should reject the report and send the conferees on the part of the Senate back to conference, to return with a report which does not contain the objectionable language.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly it is not my intention to do what the distinguished Senator from Oregon suggests. I simply stated my understanding that there is to be a further conference, and that a satisfactory statement would be spelled out in a report. I understood the Senator from Massachusetts was going to meet in conference, with the Representative from California. I did not vote with them. I voted for the safety program.

I trust the Senator from Oregon will not misunderstand the position taken by the conferees on the part of the Senate. I know the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and myself voted for certain language, but the House conferees overruled us. I wish it were possible to do as the Senator from Oregon suggests. I warn the Senator that if the report goes back to conference, it will be the whole bill unless some other provision is made. We will not be able to go back to conference on one item, such as the safety regulations of the ICC, without considering also housing and the TVA.

The conferees labored long and hard in connection with many important items. I say again to my distinguished

friend, the Senator from Oregon, that in my opinion if the Senator from Massachusetts and the Representative from California can work out certain details and submit them in a report, I believe it would be the better part of wisdom to accept the report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield, that I may ask a question of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Let me ask the Senator from South Carolina, do I correctly understand that the suggested procedure would mean that the Senator is proposing that the conference report now on the desk in the Senate, officially filed, can be changed through a conference participated in by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Representative from California and someone in the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course I did not suggest that.

Mr. MORSE. We have the report.

Mr. MAYBANK. No. I said they would file a report after conferences with members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or that there might be an understanding that the authorization would be continued—to be used, as I understood—until the Wolf report can be made. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator does not understand my question.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator made it very clear.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator think the Senator from Massachusetts and the Representative from California, and all of the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission combined, could do anything to change the language of the conference report?

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course they could not.

Mr. MORSE. I want the language changed.

Mr. MAYBANK. A record can be made here, on the part of the able Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Louisiana, and any other Senator, to indicate a desire to have the Interstate Commerce Commission go along with the present plan, if that is agreed upon, until the Wolf report is made.

Mr. MORSE. It would not have the slightest effect, legally.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. As a matter of fact, in regard to the statement of the Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as I understand, has already issued a statement, in view of the language which is now contained in the conference report, to the effect that he has no other alternative than to close down the field offices of the ICC for safety inspection. So obviously the conference report will have to go back to conference, it seems to me, for the change in the language, in view of the position that has been taken by the ICC.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say that if the bill went back to conference a great deal of language would be changed in the report, other than the language about which we are talking.

Mr. President, I desire to make a request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5969) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, before the bill is passed, I should like to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Illinois that the bill has been read the third time and under the rule amendments are not in order after the bill has been read the third time.

The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 5969) was passed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. CHAVEZ conferees on the part of the Senate.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 601, Senate Joint Resolution 96.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 96) to strengthen the foreign relations of the United States by establishing a Commission on International Telecommunications.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 10, after the word "one" it is proposed to strike out "each"; in line 11, after the word "and", to insert "at least one from"; in line 12, after the word "of", to strike out "education" and insert "education and of whom not more than three shall be from the same political party"; in line 15, after the word "Senate", to insert "of whom not more than one shall be from the same political party"; at the beginning of line 19, to insert "of whom not more than one shall be from the same political party"; at the top of page 3, to strike out:

(b) Political affiliation: Of the first class of members mentioned in subsection (a), no more than three members shall be from the same political party. Of the second and third classes of members mentioned in subsection (a) only one member shall be selected from the same political party.

In line 18, after the word "but", to insert "without regard to any other provision of law"; in line 22, after the word "Commission", to insert "and reasonable advances may be made to them for such purposes"; on page 4, line 3, after the word "but", to insert "without regard to any other provision of law"; in line 6, after the word "Commission", to insert "and reasonable advances may be made to them for such purposes"; at the beginning of line 17 to insert "per annum"; in line 18, after the figures "\$12,500", to insert "per annum"; in line 24, after the word "for", to strike out "individuals" and insert "each individual"; in line 25, after the word "authorized", to insert "without regard to any other provision of law"; on page 5, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$250,000"; in line 11, after the word "before", to insert "December 31, 1954"; in line 13, after the word "Congress" to insert "It may submit such interim reports as it deems desirable"; on page 6, at the beginning of line 22, to insert "times and"; in the same line, after the word "abroad", to strike out "and at such times"; in line 25, after the word "oaths", to insert "and"; on page 7, line 1, after the word "testimony", to strike out "and to make such lawful expenditures".

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, after line 5, it is proposed to insert:

(b) The Commission may authorize the Chairman or the Vice Chairman to make the expenditures herein authorized and such other expenditures as the Commission may deem advisable: *Provided, however*, That when the Commission ceases its activities it shall submit to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives a statement of its fiscal trans-

actions properly audited by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe the Senator from Nevada refers to the paragraph on page 7, beginning with line 6 and ending with line 13. The provision is included for the specific purpose of setting up a means of auditing expenses. As the joint resolution was originally submitted, there was no proper means of deciding who should audit or pass upon the propriety of expenses of the Commission. The provision was written by the legislative counsel, I believe, in conjunction with the Comptroller General, as affording a means for proper auditing of the expenses.

Mr. McCARRAN. Can the Senator tell us if that provision has had study on the part of the Comptroller General?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am told that it was submitted to the Comptroller General. I instructed the assistant of the Foreign Relations Committee to see that there was prepared a proper auditing provision. If my memory does not fail me, I feel very confident that this question was taken up with the Comptroller General, and that it is a proper auditing provision.

Mr. McCARRAN. Naturally it would come before the Comptroller General eventually.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is our intention that it be presented to the Comptroller General for proper auditing.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The language says that when the Commission ceases its activities it shall submit to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives a statement of its fiscal transactions, properly audited by the Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is when the windup comes.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. In the meantime, who audits the affairs?

Mr. HILL. The Commission is just now being created. It will wind up its affairs on or before December 31, 1954. By the time it is appointed it will not have much more than a year in which to do its work, and when it does its work it must make a report to the Appropriations Committees of the respective Houses, properly audited by the Comptroller General.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Nevada asked the question as to whether this paragraph had been passed upon by the Comptroller General. The accounts are to be audited by the Comptroller General. We requested that the provision be so written. I am very certain that this provision was submitted to the Comptroller General and that it was considered by him proper language for the auditing provision.

1953

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9965

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 7, after line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 14, to change the subsection letter from "(b)" to "(c)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I ask that they be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated. Without objection, they will be considered en bloc.

The CHIEF CLERK. On pages 1 and 2, strike out all in the third paragraph of recitals.

On page 2, strike out all in the fourth paragraph of recitals.

On page 2, line 4, immediately after the word "on", insert the words "Governmental use of."

On page 5, strike out all in lines 20 to 25, inclusive.

On page 6, strike out all in lines 1 to 17 inclusive, and insert the following:

SEC. 9. The Commission is directed to examine, study, and report on the objectives, operations, and effectiveness of our information programs with respect to the prompt development of techniques, methods, and programs for greatly expanded and far more effective operations in this vital area of foreign policy through the use of foreign telecommunications.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as originally introduced, Senate Joint Resolution 96 would deal with a great many matters which come under the jurisdiction of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The object and effect of the amendments which have been offered, and which are being considered en bloc, is to remove from the joint resolution all matters which come under the jurisdiction of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate. As the joint resolution would read, if these amendments were adopted, it would deal only with matters properly coming under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee. All references to our domestic communications facilities have been removed from the joint resolution, and it deals merely with information, propaganda, and other things which our Government is using in the foreign field.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado very properly raised the question upon which his amendment is based. I submitted it to the various authors of the joint resolution. We agree that he has a good point, and that these amendments may properly be incorporated in the joint resolution. Therefore, I am perfectly willing to accept them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amend-

ment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Whereas the overseas information program as carried on through the media of telecommunications is of continuing and increasing importance in carrying out and supporting the foreign policies of the United States; and

Whereas in his state of the Union message, February 2, 1953, the President asserted the necessity "to make more effective all activities related to international information": Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Governmental Use of International Telecommunications (in this act referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of nine members as follows:

(1) Five appointed by the President of the United States, of whom at least one shall be appointed from the telecommunications industry and at least one from the field of education and of whom not more than three shall be from the same political party;

(2) Two appointed from the Senate by the President of the Senate of whom not more than one shall be from the same political party; and

(3) Two appointed from the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives of whom not more than one shall be from the same political party.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. The Commission shall choose its Chairman and Vice Chairman from among its members and shall establish its own procedure.

QUORUM

SEC. 4. Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but without regard to any other provision of law they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission and reasonable advances may be made to them for such purposes.

(b) Members of the executive branch: Any members of the Commission who may be in the executive branch of the Government shall receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, but without regard to any other provision of law they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission and reasonable advances may be made to them for such purposes.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall receive not to exceed \$75 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. The Commission shall have power to appoint a Secretary General at a salary of not to exceed \$15,000 per annum, and an Assistant Secretary General at a salary of

not to exceed \$12,500 per annum, and such other personnel in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or to obtain assistance from Government agencies on a reimbursable basis. The Commission is further authorized to employ experts and consultants for temporary and intermittent personal services, but at rates not to exceed \$75 per diem for each individual. The Commission is authorized without regard to any other provision of law to reimburse employees, experts, and consultants for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their official duties and to make reasonable advances to such persons for such purposes.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed \$250,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

REPORT—EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. (a) Report: On or before December 31, 1954, the Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress. It may submit such interim reports as it deems desirable.

(b) Expiration of the Commission: Ninety days after the submission of the Congress of the report provided for in subsection (a) of this section 8, the Commission shall cease to exist.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. The Commission is directed to examine, study, and report on the objectives, operations, and effectiveness of our information programs with respect to the prompt development of techniques, methods, and programs for greatly expanded and far more effective operations in this vital area of foreign policy through the use of foreign telecommunications.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and sit and act at such times and places in the United States and abroad, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission and shall be served by any person designated by him.

(b) The Commission may authorize the Chairman or the Vice Chairman to make the expenditures herein authorized and such other expenditures as the Commission may deem advisable: *Provided, however,* That when the Commission ceases its activities it shall submit to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives a statement of its fiscal transactions properly audited by the Comptroller General of the United States.

(c) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or by the Vice Chairman when acting as Chairman.

The preamble was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to strengthen the foreign relations of the United States by establishing a Commission on Governmental Use of International Telecommunications."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1954— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.
(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 22, 1953, pp. 9708-9710.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I would like to make a very brief explanation of the conference report.

The Senate version of the bill called for \$716,779,768. The conference agreed upon \$718,395,398, or an increase of \$1,615,630 over the appropriations contained in the Senate bill.

The increase consisted of the following:

Five million dollars in appropriations for the watershed protection program, which item was originally inserted by the House but deleted by the Senate. The Senate conferees agreed to accept this House provision. There were decreases in the items for forest roads and trails, of \$1,500,000; in funds for research of \$350,370; and for control programs, of \$1,483,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What was done with respect to the REA soil conservation?

Mr. YOUNG. There was no disagreement in conference with respect to soil conservation funds. Both versions of the bill contained an item of \$195 million. The bill now contains \$205 million for REA, that is, with carry-over funds. The appropriation for the fiscal year 1953 was \$197 million.

With respect to REA, there was an appropriation of \$35 million a year ago, plus \$7,500,000 in the supplemental bill approved last month, as against an appropriation in this bill of \$67,500,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So, the appropriation is \$67,500,000?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. As I understand, the conference report contains an item for the control of water runoff at source, in the sum \$5 million.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the fact that the conference decided to retain this item, because I believe it is the beginning of a very worthwhile program. The project is to be re-

garded as a pilot or test project. I am glad that is to be the case. If there are to be such projects in the future, I trust appropriate legislation will be introduced.

Mr. YOUNG. I know the Senator from Kansas has had a great interest in this project, and he has made many contacts with the committee. He has worked very hard for this program. I am glad the conference agreed on this program.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, in the report on the Agricultural Appropriation bill, submitted by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] as I understand, the conferees allowed approximately \$5 million for certain watershed projects, some of which happen to be in the State of Kansas. I am glad the conferees saw fit to provide the appropriation. It is a very important program, and much interest has been manifested in such programs in my State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CENSUS OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, because I know that a number of Senators are very much interested in transportation, and more especially in the problem of developing a long-range program for providing the transportation statistics which are urgently needed in time of war or in connection with a defense emergency, it is my purpose to seek insertion in the RECORD of an interchange of correspondence which I have had with the Secretary of Commerce.

As background, let me point out that I have been one of those very much interested in the development of sound techniques and methods for taking, tabulating and interpreting a periodic census of transportation. With the aid of other Senators, I was able to assist in securing enactment of legislation to authorize such a periodic census.

Unfortunately, the census of transportation, although authorized, has not yet been taken. The law provides that the census shall be taken every 4 years. But Congress failed to appropriate funds for the census 4 years ago, and has failed again this year to appropriate funds for that census.

It is my earnest opinion, Mr. President, as I have informed the Secretary of Commerce, that this represented false economy on the part of the Congress. I want to say that I do not feel the fault is wholly that of the Congress, because I do not believe the Department of Commerce has done its best either to develop a sound and tested program for the census of transportation, or to present its request for funds for that census in the most convincing manner. I know that there was for a time, in the Census Bureau, a group which had opposed enactment of the law authorizing a census of transportation; a group which, I am confident, had no enthusiasm for effective administration of the law with respect to that census, and which, to put

it mildly, probably did very little to advance the program for a transportation census.

I am happy to say that after the interchange of correspondence with Secretary Weeks, which I shall shortly ask may be inserted in the RECORD, I do not have the feeling that the Department of Commerce under the present administration is resisting the will of the Congress, as expressed in the law providing for a census of transportation; and I am both anxious and pleased to accept the assurances of the Secretary of Commerce that the Department intends to continue to explore this whole program as far as appropriations made available by the Congress may permit. For my own part, I shall continue to urge the appropriation of adequate funds for a census of transportation, because I know, from a rather intensive study of this subject which I made some 8 or 9 years ago, just how urgently we shall need, in the event of a true national emergency, the transportation data which only such a census can provide. I hope that Senators having a natural interest in this matter—and I know there are a number of my colleagues who fall in this category—will continue to work toward this same end. I hope further that other Senators will look into the matter as time permits. I even venture the final hope that at least some of the many executives in business and industry who could profitably use the statistics which a census of transportation would develop, will inform their Senators and Representatives of their interest.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point the correspondence to which I have previously referred.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 30, 1953.

The Honorable SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Five years ago (by Public Law 671 of the 80th Cong.) Congress authorized and directed the taking of a census of transportation.

The Census Bureau presented a hastily developed program for 1948, a program not in line with apparent congressional intent, and certainly not in line with the sponsor of the legislation, the writer of this letter.

A second program was presented by the Census Bureau for 1953; a program called experimental or pilot by Department spokesmen. For instance, Secretary Weeks said the Bureau is "planning to take a pilot run" (p. 5, House hearings); and Dr. Burgess said the census of transportation "is feeling its way" (p. 80 of House hearings).

The question occurs, why was the census of transportation put on a pilot basis, in the face of the law authorizing it?

In 1948, Mr. Grieves of the Census Bureau testified that the Bureau had "not even any opportunity to formulate a tested program" (p. 75 of House hearings). In regard to the 1953 program, Mr. Grieves said: "We have devoted the past 2 years to working out a practical approach to this difficult problem" (p. 72, House hearings). A little later in his testimony, Mr. Grieves said: "Five years from now, when this census comes up again, it would appear that there would be a better opportunity